

Appendix K
Comments Received From SHMT and FEMA

Instructions for Using the Plan Review Crosswalk for Review of Standard State Hazard Mitigation Plans

Attached is a Plan Review Crosswalk based on the **Multi-Hazard Mitigation Planning Guidance Under the Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000**, published by FEMA, with revisions dated November 2006. This Plan Review Crosswalk is consistent with the *Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000* (P.L. 106-390), enacted October 30, 2000 and *44 CFR Part 201 – Mitigation Planning, Interim Final Rule* (the Rule), published February 26, 2002.

SCORING SYSTEM

N – Needs Improvement: The plan does not meet the minimum for the requirement. Reviewer's comments must be provided.

S – Satisfactory: The plan meets the minimum for the requirement. Reviewer's comments are encouraged, but not required.

Each requirement includes separate elements. All elements of a requirement must be rated "Satisfactory" in order for the requirement to be fulfilled and receive a summary score of "Satisfactory." A "Needs Improvement" score on elements shaded in gray (recommended but not required) will not preclude the plan from passing.

Optional matrices for assisting in the review of sections on profiling hazards and assessing vulnerability are found at the end of the Plan Review Crosswalk.

The example below illustrates how to fill in the Plan Review Crosswalk.

Example**Assessing Vulnerability by Jurisdiction**

Requirement §201.4(c)(2)(ii): *[The State risk assessment shall include an] overview and analysis of the State's vulnerability to the hazards described in this paragraph (c)(2), based on estimates provided in local risk assessments The State shall describe vulnerability in terms of the jurisdictions most threatened by the identified hazards, and most vulnerable to damage and loss associated with hazard event.*

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A. Does the plan describe the State's vulnerability based on information from the local risk assessments?	Section III, pp. 12-28	The plan includes a description of local vulnerable structures. The plan presented a vulnerability summary by regions in the State. This information was collected from the approved plans on file.		✓
B. Does the plan present information on those jurisdictions that face the most risk?	Section III, pp. 30-36	<p>The vulnerability description did not indicate which jurisdictions were the most vulnerable.</p> <p>Required Revisions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use the information provided in the summaries to determine which jurisdictions are most threatened by the identified hazards. Identify which jurisdictions have suffered or are likely to suffer the most losses. If data are not readily available, note these data limitations in the plan. Include actions in the mitigation strategy to obtain these data for the plan update. 	✓	
SUMMARY SCORE			✓	

Standard State Hazard Mitigation Plan Review and Approval Status

State Point of Contact: Debbie Peery	Address: 5898 County Road 41 P. O. Box Drawer 2160 Clanton, Alabama 35046-2160
Title: State Hazard Mitigation Officer	
Agency: Alabama Emergency Management Agency	
Phone Number: (205) 280-2476	E-Mail: debbiep@ema.alabama.gov

FEMA Reviewer: George Boughton Brenda Stirrup Matthew Buddie	Title: Hazard Mitigation Community Planner Hazard Mitigation Community Planner Hazard Mitigation Community Planner	Date: July 10, 2007 July 17, 2007 July 17, 2007
Date Received in FEMA Region IV	June 21, 2007	
Plan Not Approved		
Plan Approved		
Date Approved		

STANDARD STATE HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN SUMMARY CROSSWALK

The plan cannot be approved if the plan has not been formally adopted.

Each requirement includes separate elements. All elements of the requirement must be rated "Satisfactory" in order for the requirement to be fulfilled and receive a score of "Satisfactory." Elements of each requirement are listed on the following pages of the Plan Review Crosswalk. A "Needs Improvement" score on elements shaded in gray (recommended but not required) will not preclude the plan from passing. Reviewer's comments must be provided for requirements receiving a "Needs Improvement" score.

SCORING SYSTEM

Please check one of the following for each requirement.

N – Needs Improvement: The plan does not meet the minimum for the requirement.
Reviewer's comments must be provided.

S – Satisfactory: The plan meets the minimum for the requirement. Reviewer's comments are encouraged, but not required.

Prerequisite	NOT MET	MET
Adoption by the State: §201.4(c)(6) and §201.4(c)(7)	X	

Planning Process	N	S
Documentation of the Planning Process: §201.4(c)(1)		X
Coordination Among Agencies: §201.4(b)		X
Program Integration: §201.4(b)		X

Risk Assessment	N	S
Identifying Hazards: §201.4(c)(2)(i)		X
Profiling Hazards: §201.4(c)(2)(i)	X	
Assessing Vulnerability by Jurisdiction: §201.4(c)(2)(ii)	X	
Assessing Vulnerability of State Facilities: §201.4(c)(2)(ii)		X
Estimating Potential Losses by Jurisdiction: §201.4(c)(2)(iii)		X
Estimating Potential Losses of State Facilities: §201.4(c)(2)(iii)		X

Mitigation Strategy

Hazard Mitigation Goals: §201.4(c)(3)(i)
 State Capability Assessment: §201.4(c)(3)(ii)
 Local Capability Assessment: §201.4(c)(3)(ii)
 Mitigation Actions: §201.4(c)(3)(iii)
 Funding Sources: §201.4(c)(3)(iv)

N	S
	X
	X
	X
	X
	X

Coordination of Local Mitigation Planning

Local Funding and Technical Assistance: §201.4(c)(4)(i)
 Local Plan Integration: §201.4(c)(4)(ii)
 Prioritizing Local Assistance: §201.4(c)(4)(iii)

N	S
	X
X	
	X

Plan Maintenance Process

Monitoring, Evaluating, and Updating the Plan: §201.4(c)(5)(i)
 Monitoring Progress of Mitigation Activities: §201.4(c)(5)(ii) and (iii)

N	S
	X
	X

STANDARD STATE HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN APPROVAL STATUS

PLAN NOT APPROVED

PLAN APPROVED

See Reviewer's Comments

PREREQUISITE

Adoption by the State

Requirement §201.4(c)(6): The plan **must** be formally adopted by the State prior to submittal to [FEMA] for final review and approval.

Requirement §201.4(c)(7): The plan **must** include assurances that the State will comply with all applicable Federal statutes and regulations in effect with respect to the periods for which it receives grant funding, in compliance with 44 CFR 13.11(c). The State will amend its plan whenever necessary to reflect changes in State or Federal laws and statutes as required in 44 CFR 13.11(d).

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			NOT MET	MET
A. Has the State formally adopted the new or updated plan?	Section 3, P. 3-2 and Appendix C	<p>This is a draft review. Formal adoption of the Plan is not required at this time. The Draft did not contain the location of the adoption letter.</p> <p>Required Revision:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> When the planning process is complete, the State must formally adopt the updated Plan. In the original plan the adoption letter was included in Appendix O and was signed by the Executive Director of the Alabama Emergency Management Agency in accordance Alabama Executive Order 19. <p>See pages 1-2 to 1-3 in the Standard State Pan Update Guidance.</p>	X	
B. Does the plan provide assurances that the State will continue to comply with all applicable Federal statutes and regulations during the periods for which it receives grant funding, in compliance with 44 CFR 13.11(c), and will amend its plan whenever necessary to reflect changes in State or Federal laws and statutes as required in 44 CFR 13.11(d)?	Section 3, P. 3-2 and Appendix B	<p>This is a draft review. The inclusion of assurances that the State will continue to comply with all applicable Federal statutes and regulations during the periods for which it receives grant funding, in compliance with 44 CFR 13.11(c), and will amend its plan whenever necessary to reflect changes in State or Federal laws and statutes as required in 44 CFR 13.11(d) is not required at this time.</p> <p>Required Revision:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> When the planning process is complete, the State must include the required assurances in Appendix B. <p>See pages 1-2 to 1-3 in the Standard State Pan Update Guidance.</p>	X	
SUMMARY SCORE			X	

PLANNING PROCESS: §201.4(b): *An effective planning process is essential in developing and maintaining a good plan.*

Documentation of the Planning Process

Requirement §201.4(c)(1): *[The State plan **must** include a] description of the planning process used to develop the plan, including how it was prepared, who was involved in the process, and how other agencies participated.*

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A. Does the plan provide a narrative description of how the new or updated plan was prepared?	Section 4, Pp. 4-1 through 4-24 and Appendices C, D, I, K, and L	The plan provides a narrative description of how the updated plan was prepared. Additional information can also be found in Sections 5, 6, 7, 8 where the plan goes into greater detail on the Risk and Vulnerability Assessments, Mitigation Strategy, Coordination of Local Planning, and Plan Maintenance updates respectively.		X
B. Does the new or updated plan indicate who was involved in the current planning process?	Section 4, Pp. 4-3 through 4-9, 4-13 through 4-20, and Appendices C and D	The updated plan describes who was involved in the update process. See especially pages 13-20. Recommended Revision: <ul style="list-style-type: none">It would be useful to list the membership of the Technical Advisory Committee.		X
C. Does the new or updated plan indicate how other agencies participated in the current planning process?	Section 4, Pp. 4-3 through 4-23, Appendices C and D	The updated plan describes how other agencies in the government participated in the planning process.		X
D. Does the updated plan document how the planning team reviewed and analyzed each section of the plan?	Section 4, Pp. 4-1 through 4-23. Sections 5, 6 and 7	The updated plan documents how the planning team reviewed and analyzed each section of the plan. See especially Section 4 pages 21-23 for a summary of this analysis. Sections 5, 6, and 7 also contain information on this element.		X
E. Does the updated plan indicate for each section whether or not it was revised as part of the update process?	See the first page of Sections 3-8	The plan contains a table as part of the first page of Sections 3-8 entitled What Has Been Updated. The table summarizes the changes, if any, made in each subsection of the plan.		X
SUMMARY SCORE				X

Coordination Among Agencies

Requirement §201.4(b): The [State] mitigation planning process *should* include coordination with other State agencies, appropriate Federal agencies, interested groups, and

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A. Does the new or updated plan describe how Federal and State agencies were involved in the current planning process?	Section 4, Pp. 4-3 through 4-21 and Appendices C, D, and I	The State Hazard Mitigation Team (SHMT) consists of 24 State, Federal, and Regional Agencies. The Team oversaw the development of the plan. 8 additional State, Federal, and Regional Agencies established formal points of contact. Key roles were played by FEMA, the National Weather Service, the Corps of Engineers, the Geological Service of Alabama, the Alabama Office of Water Resources, and the Alabama Emergency Management Agency.		X
B. Does the new or updated plan describe how interested groups (e.g., businesses, non-profit organizations, and other interested parties) were involved in the current planning process?	Section 4, Pp. 4-3 through 4-21 and Appendices C, D, and I.	The Directors of the following groups served on the SHMT: Alabama Association of Regional Councils, the Alabama League of Municipalities, the Association of County Commissioners, and the Choctawhatchee, Pea, and Yellow Rivers Watershed Management. The American Red Cross established a formal point of contact. In addition The Regional Planning Councils, the local Emergency Management Agencies, and the Alabama Association of Regional Councils played a role in plan development. The draft plan will be made available to the public on the State's website and comments will be solicited once the draft review is completed. Recommended Revision: <ul style="list-style-type: none">In future plan updates the SHMT may wish to involve academic institutions, businesses, and additional non-profits in the planning process.		X
C. Does the updated plan discuss how coordination among Federal and State agencies changed since approval of the previous plan?	Section 4, Pp. 4-1 through 4-23 and Appendix C.	The plan discusses how coordination among Federal and State agencies changed since the approval of the previous plan. See especially Section 4.2 and 4.5.3. Recommended Revision: <ul style="list-style-type: none">In future updates of the plan the SHMT may wish to discuss Memorandums of Understanding or other work agreements among government agencies and other States.		X
SUMMARY SCORE				X

Program Integration

Requirement §201.4(b): *[The State mitigation planning process **should**] be integrated to the extent possible with other ongoing State planning efforts as well as other FEMA mitigation programs and initiatives.*

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A. Does the new or updated plan describe how the State mitigation planning process is integrated with other ongoing State planning efforts?	Section 4, Pp. 4-4 through 4-9	Section 4.3 of the updated plan describes the State's integration of the mitigation planning process with other ongoing State planning efforts. The updated plan also outlines six improvements to the integration process that can be implemented prior to the next plan update.		X
B. Does the new or updated plan describe how the State mitigation planning process is integrated with FEMA mitigation programs and initiatives?	Section 4, Pp. 4-9 through 4-11	Section 4.4 of the updated plan describes the State's integration of the mitigation planning process with FEMA mitigation programs and initiatives. The updated plan also outlines 11 improvements to the integration process that can be implemented prior to the next plan update.		X
SUMMARY SCORE				X

RISK ASSESSMENT: §201.4(c)(2): *[The State plan must include a risk assessment] that provides the factual basis for activities proposed in the strategy portion of the mitigation plan. Statewide risk assessments must characterize and analyze natural hazards and risks to provide a statewide overview. This overview will allow the State to compare potential losses throughout the State and to determine their priorities for implementing mitigation measures under the strategy, and to prioritize jurisdictions for receiving technical and financial support in developing more detailed local risk and vulnerability assessments.*

Identifying Hazards

Requirement §201.4(c)(2)(i): *[The State risk assessment **shall** include an] overview of the type ... of all natural hazards that can affect the State*

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A. Does the new or updated plan provide a description of the type of all natural hazards that can affect the State? If the hazard identification omits (without explanation) any hazards commonly recognized as threats to the State, this part of the plan cannot receive a Satisfactory score.	Section 5, P. 5-3 and Appendix H	The updated plan provides a description of the following 13 hazards: Floods (storm surge, riverine, flash flood, etc), High Winds (hurricanes, tornadoes, wind storms), Winter/Ice Storms, Landslides, Land Subsidence, Earthquakes, Drought, Hail, Wildfires, Extreme Temperature, Lighting, Dam Failure, and Tsunamis. Hazardous Materials and Manmade Hazards were deleted from the list of hazards that was approved in the 2004 plan. The SHMT approved the list of included hazards on April 25 th 2007. Appendix H provides a general description of all hazards that are profiled in the plan.		X

SUMMARY SCORE

X

Profiling Hazards

Requirement §201.4(c)(2)(i): [The State risk assessment **shall** include an overview of the] location of all natural hazards that can affect the State, including information on previous occurrences of hazard events, as well as the probability of future hazard events, using maps where appropriate

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A. Does the risk assessment identify the location (i.e., geographic area affected) of each natural hazards addressed in the new or updated plan?	Section 5, Pp. 5-6 through 5-55	A location is provided for each natural hazard included in the plan. Recommended Revision: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Page 5-41 in the Hail Section states that hail occurs throughout the State but goes on to say that after reviewing available local mitigation plans only 56 out of 66 counties identified hail as a hazard they were vulnerable to. These statements seem to contradict each other and should be addressed. It may be that the locals are not fully aware of the threat and may require technical assistance from the State in identifying the risk. 		X
B. Does the new or updated plan provide information on previous occurrences of each hazard addressed in the plan?	Section 5, Pp. 5-4 through 5-55	The plan does a good job of providing a brief history of previous occurrences of each identified hazard. Significant events were added since the initial plan was approved in 2004. Pages 5-4 and 5-5 provide a table of all Federal Declared Disasters up to June of 2007.		X
C. Does the new or updated plan include the probability of future events (i.e., chance of occurrence) for each hazard addressed in the plan?	Section 5, Pp. 5-6 through 5-55	The plan includes some type of discussion on the probability of future events for each identified hazard except for Winter/Ice Storms. Page 5-22 contains a section titled "Probability of Winter Storms in Alabama" and shows a historical occurrence map of winter storms from 1993-2006 but does not discuss what this data means in terms of future occurrence. Required Revisions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Readdress the probability of future events for Winter/Ice Storms to include what can be expected in the future. See pages 1-18 to 1-22 in the Standard State Pan Update Guidance.	X	
SUMMARY SCORE			X	

Assessing Vulnerability

Requirement §201.4(c)(2)(ii): [The State risk assessment **shall** include an] overview and analysis of the State's vulnerability to the hazards described in this paragraph (c)(2), based on estimates provided in local risk assessments as well as the State risk assessment. The State **shall** describe vulnerability in terms of September 2007

the jurisdictions most threatened by the identified hazards, and most vulnerable to damage and loss associated with hazard events. State owned critical or operated facilities located in the identified hazard areas shall also be addressed ...

Requirement §201.4(d): Plan must be reviewed and revised to reflect changes in development...

Assessing Vulnerability by Jurisdiction

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A. Does the new or updated plan describe the State's vulnerability based on estimates provided in local risk assessments as well as the State risk assessment?	Section 5, Pp. 5-56, 5-61 through 5-69, 5-73 through 5-114 Section 7, Pp. 7-9 through 7-15	The plan discusses only flooding events, high wind events, and earthquakes in terms of vulnerability. The plan goes into more detail on these hazards because they have the highest potential to affect the State or its Citizens in the future as stated on page 5-56. The plan states on page 7-11 that in March 2007, 64 FEMA approved local hazard mitigation plans had been reviewed so information could be included in the State Plan.		X
B. Does the new or updated plan describe the State's vulnerability in terms of the jurisdictions most threatened and most vulnerable to damage and loss associated with hazard event(s)?	Section 5, Pp. 5-110 through 5-114	The plan lists vulnerability in terms of the top seven counties for the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none">◆ Expected Future Flood Losses◆ Number of Rep Loss Properties◆ Population in 100-yr Floodplain◆ Potential Flood Damage to Critical Facilities◆ Potential Tornado Damage◆ Potential Hurricane Wind Damage The Seismic Risk of the nine most populous counties is provided on page 5-113.		X
C. Does the updated plan explain the process used to analyze the information from the local risk assessments, as necessary?	Section 7, Pp. 7-11 through 7-15	The plan describes the process used to analyze the data from the local risk assessments to be incorporated into the state plan. Recommended Revision: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Page 7-12 states that upon review, the data in local risk assessments were inconsistent in the manner which they were provided. It may be helpful for the State to provide assistance to the locals during local plan updates to come up with a format to standardize the process making the data more useful in determining risk.		X
D. Does the updated plan reflect changes in development for jurisdictions in hazard prone areas?		The plan does not reflect changes in development that may affect vulnerability for the hazard prone jurisdictions. For example, there is no discussion of significant population increases, shifts in population, or population projections to vulnerable areas; no discussion of changes in land use or land use activities to vulnerable areas; no discussion of completed	X	

		mitigation activities that have reduced vulnerability.		
		Required Revision: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discuss changes in development that may impact vulnerability to the hazard prone jurisdictions and clearly demonstrate this information was used to obtain a statewide picture of change to vulnerability. 		
		See pages 1-23 to 1-26 in the Standard State Pan Update Guidance.		
SUMMARY SCORE			X	

Assessing Vulnerability of State Facilities

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A. Does the new or updated plan describe the types of State owned or operated critical facilities located in the identified hazard areas?	Section 5, Pp. 5-92, 5-105, 5-109	The plan states there is no comprehensive list of State owned or operated critical facilities currently available. The plan uses HAZUS data which does not delineate between local and State owned public facilities. A complete list of State facilities at risk to flood, wind, and earthquakes is expected to be completed by summer of 2008 and incorporated into the plan (page 5-92).		X
SUMMARY SCORE				X

Estimating Potential Losses

Requirement §201.4(c)(2)(iii): [The State risk assessment **shall** include an] overview and analysis of potential losses to the identified vulnerable structures, based on estimates provided in local risk assessments as well as the State risk assessment. The State **shall** estimate the potential dollar losses to State owned or operated buildings, infrastructure, and critical facilities located in the identified hazard areas.

Requirement §201.4(d): Plan must be reviewed and revised to reflect changes in development...

Estimating Potential Losses by Jurisdiction

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A. Does the new or updated plan present an overview and analysis of the potential losses to the identified vulnerable structures?	Section 5, Pp. 5-87 through 5-88, 5-95 through 5-97, 5-102 through 5-103, 5-106 through 5-107	The plan uses HAZUS data to identify and analysis potential losses to vulnerable structures to flooding events, wind events, and earthquakes.		X
B. Are the potential losses based on estimates provided in local risk	Section 5,	The plan uses local risk assessments to estimate potential		X

STANDARD STATE HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN REVIEW CROSSWALK

FEMA REGION IV

State: Alabama

Date of Plan: July 2007

assessments as well as the State risk assessment?	Pp. 5-61 through 5-114 Section 7 Pp. 7-9 through 7-15	losses when available The plan states on page 7-11 that in March 2007, 64 FEMA approved local hazard mitigation plans had been reviewed so information could be included in the State Plan.		
C. Does the updated plan reflect the effects of changes in development on loss estimates?	Section 5, Pp. 5-87 through 5-88, 5-95 through 5-97, 5-102 through 5-103, 5-106 through 5-107	The plan provides potential losses for future risk.		X
SUMMARY SCORE				X

Estimating Potential Losses of State Facilities

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A. Does the new or updated plan present an estimate of the potential dollar losses to State owned or operated buildings, infrastructure, and critical facilities in the identified hazard areas?	Section 5, Pp. 5-92, 5-105, 5-109	The plan states there is no comprehensive list of State owned or operated critical facilities currently available. The plan uses HAZUS data which does not delineate between local and State owned public facilities. A complete list of State facilities at risk to flood, wind, and earthquakes is expected to be completed by summer of 2008 and incorporated into the plan (page 5-92).		X
SUMMARY SCORE				X

MITIGATION STRATEGY: §201.4(c)(3) [To be effective the plan must include a] Mitigation Strategy that provides the State's blueprint for reducing the losses identified in the risk assessment.

Hazard Mitigation Goals

Requirement §201.4(c)(3)(i): [The State mitigation strategy *shall* include a] description of State goals to guide the selection of activities to mitigate and reduce potential losses.

Requirement §201.4(d): Plan must be reviewed and revised to reflect changes in development, progress in statewide mitigation efforts, and changes in priorities...

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A. Does the new or updated plan provide a description of State mitigation goals that guide the selection of mitigation activities?	Section 6, Pp. 6-2 through 6-3	The plan provides a comprehensive set of updated mitigation goals that were used as the basis for the mitigation activities.		X

STANDARD STATE HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN REVIEW CROSSWALK
FEMA REGION IV

State: Alabama

Date of Plan: July 2007

B. Does the updated plan demonstrate that the goals were assessed and either remain valid or have been revised?	Section 6, Pp. 6-2 through 6-3	The State Hazard Mitigation Team (SHMT) and the Alabama Emergency Management Agency (AEMA) evaluated the goals that were established in the previous plan to assess their continued validity. That included a formal review during a SHMT meeting as well as a survey of State agencies. The goals were re-affirmed and the wording was refined to better communicate their intent.		X
SUMMARY SCORE				X

State Capability Assessment Requirement §201.4(c)(3)(ii): *[The State mitigation strategy **shall** include a] discussion of the State's pre-and post-disaster hazard management policies, programs, and capabilities to mitigate the hazards in the area, including: an evaluation of State laws, regulations, policies, and programs related to hazard mitigation as well as to development in hazard-prone areas [and] a discussion of State funding capabilities for hazard mitigation projects*

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A. Does the new or updated plan include an evaluation of the State's pre-disaster hazard management policies, programs, and capabilities?	Section 6, Pp. 6-3 through 6-10, 6-14 through 6-15	<p>The updated plan includes an evaluation of the State's pre-disaster hazard management policies, programs, and capabilities, including, but not limited to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Coastal Program Regulations o Alabama Coastal Area Management Plan o Alabama Shoreline Erosion and Hazard Mitigation Plan o Participation in the CRS o Participation in the NFIP <p>Pre-disaster programs in Alabama are established primarily at the local, rather than the State level. This ensures proactive participation.</p> <p>The Emergency Management Accreditation Program (EMAP) was used to assess the State's policies, programs and capabilities. The State is in the process of obtaining the latest EMAP assessment for incorporation in the Plan Update.</p> <p>Recommended Revision:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Update the plan to include the latest EMAP assessments of the State's policies, programs and capabilities. 		X
B. Does the new or updated plan include an evaluation of the State's post-disaster hazard management policies, programs, and capabilities?	Section 6, Pp. 6-3 through 6-10, 6-14 through 6-15	The updated plan includes an evaluation of the State's post-disaster hazard management policies, programs, and capabilities, including the:		X

STANDARD STATE HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN REVIEW CROSSWALK
FEMA REGION IV

State: Alabama

Date of Plan: July 2007

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ State of Alabama Emergency Operations Plan (EOP) ○ Standard Operating Guidelines ○ State Administrative Plan <p>Post-disaster programs in AL are established primarily at the State level.</p> <p>The plan notes that some of the EOPs do not establish plans/procedures for maintaining critical government services or programmatic operations under disaster conditions.</p> <p>Recommended Revision:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include the most recent EMAP evaluation findings relative to continuity of government, including any discussion on maintaining critical government services or programmatic operations under disaster conditions. 		
C. Does the new or updated plan include an evaluation of the State's policies related to development in hazard prone areas ?	Section 6, Pp. 6-10 through 6-14	The plan includes a thorough evaluation of the State's policies (including laws and regulations) that influence development in hazard prone areas. It mentions that one of the most significant enabling statutes related to hazard mitigation is Title 11, Chapter 52, <i>Planning, Zoning and Subdivisions</i> of the State Code.		X
D. Does the new or updated plan include a discussion of State funding capabilities for hazard mitigation projects?	Section 6, Pp. 6-14 through 6-19	The updated plan includes a detailed discussion of State funding capabilities for hazard mitigation projects. It specifically includes all FEMA grant programs (e. g. HMGP, FMA, PDM, etc.), appropriations for AEMA and other State agencies, Community Development Block Grant Programs and other federal and local sources. HMGP continues to be the focal point of most AEMA capability. The State of Alabama Hazard Mitigation Administrative Plan documents the State's process for administering the HMGP funds.		X
E. Does the updated plan address any hazard management capabilities of the State that have changed since approval of the previous plan?	Section 6, Pp. 6-3 through 6-10, 6-23	<p>The updated plan lists numerous hazard management capabilities. It delineates which capabilities have changed since approval of the previous plan. As a result of the State's legislative review process, ACT 522 was signed into law by the Governor on April 20, 2006. The act amended the Alabama Emergency Management Act of 1955. On the same day (4.20.06), the Governor issued the 2006 State of Alabama Emergency Operations Plan to replace the previous plan that was approved in 2000.</p> <p>In addition, since Hurricane Ivan, the State has increased the shelter capacity across the State.</p> <p>Recommended Revision:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include in the plan the EMAP evaluation findings that address the hazard management capabilities of the 		X

		State have changed since approval of the previous plan.		
SUMMARY SCORE				X

Local Capability Assessment

Requirement §201.4(c)(3)(ii): [The State mitigation strategy *shall* include] a general description and analysis of the effectiveness of local mitigation policies, programs, and capabilities.

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A. Does the new or updated plan present a general description of the local mitigation policies, programs, and capabilities?	Section 6, Pp. 6-19 through 6-22, Appendix J, Pp. J1 through J18	The updated plan includes a description of the local mitigation policies, programs, and capabilities. This data was derived from an analysis of the local capabilities (town, city or county) as presented in appendix J, Table of Local Capabilities. By 2007, sixty four of the sixty seven counties had adopted Multi-jurisdictional Plans that were approved by FEMA.		X
B. Does the new or updated plan provide a general analysis of the effectiveness of local mitigation policies, programs, and capabilities?	Section 6, Pp. 6-19 through 6-22, Appendix J, Pp. J1 through J18	The updated plan provides a general analysis of the effectiveness of local mitigation policies, programs, and capabilities. The plan states that generally the jurisdictions with the largest populations and revenues have the most capabilities. Many of the rural populations have limited resources, consequently capabilities are low.		X
SUMMARY SCORE				X

Mitigation Actions

Requirement §201.4(c)(3)(iii): [State plans *shall* include an] identification, evaluation, and prioritization of cost-effective, environmentally sound, and technically feasible mitigation actions and activities the State is considering and an explanation of how each activity contributes to the overall mitigation strategy. This section *should* be linked to local plans, where specific local actions and projects are identified.

Requirement §201.4(d): Plan must be reviewed and revised to reflect changes in development, progress in statewide mitigation efforts, and changes in priorities...

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A. Does the new or updated plan identify cost-effective , environmentally sound, and technically feasible mitigations actions and activities the State is considering?	Section 6, Pp. 6-22 through 6-63	The updated plan identifies a comprehensive list of cost-effective, environmentally sound, and technically feasible mitigations actions the State has undertaken or is considering.		X
B. Does the new or updated plan evaluate these actions and activities?	Section 6, Pp. 6-22 through 6-24	The plan includes the evaluation of the mitigation actions. Actions were evaluated based on hazard events of the past three years. They were also reviewed relative to current priorities.		X

STANDARD STATE HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN REVIEW CROSSWALK

FEMA REGION IV

State: Alabama

Date of Plan: July 2007

C. Does the new or updated plan prioritize these actions and activities?	Section 6, Pp. 6-22 through 6-23, 6-35 through 6-63	<p>Many of the actions from the previous plan are ongoing.</p> <p>The plan includes actions that are derived from objectives that are based on six overarching goals. The following information is included for each action:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ hazard addressed ○ responsible agency ○ projected timeline ○ cost ○ how the action contributes to the Mitigation Strategy <p>The projected timeline addresses the priority of each action.</p> <p>Since adoption of the 2004 plan, there have been numerous large scale disasters across the state, including four Federal Disaster Declarations. Those disasters played a significant role in shaping the hazard mitigation priorities over the last three years.</p>		X
D. Does the new or updated plan explain how each activity contributes to the overall State mitigation strategy?	Section 6, Pp. 6-37 through 6-63	For each action in tables 6.8-10 through 6.8-25, a column entitled 'How Each Action Contributes to the Mitigation Strategy' is included.		X
E. Does the mitigation strategy in the new or updated section reflect actions and projects identified in local plans?	Section 6, Pp. 6-22 through 6-23, 7-9 through 7-16	The plan states that in 2007 the State reviewed all local plans that were submitted and approved by FEMA. The review focused on several areas, including mitigation strategies, goals and actions. Information was incorporated into the State Plan Update as appropriate. This was done to ensure the State mitigation strategy reflects those of the local mitigation strategies and actions.		X
SUMMARY SCORE				X

Funding Sources

Requirement §201.4(c)(3)(iv): [The State mitigation strategy **shall** include an] identification of current and potential sources of Federal, State, local, or private funding to implement mitigation activities.

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A. Does the new or updated plan identify current sources of Federal, State, local, or private funding to implement mitigation activities?	Section 6, Pp. 6-64 through 6-71	The plan identifies an inclusive list of current federal, state and local funding sources used to implement mitigation activities. Those sources of funding are labeled as 'existing'. The majority of funding used to implement mitigation activities since approval of the initial plan has been obtained from FEMA's HMGP program.		X
B. Does the new or updated plan identify potential sources of Federal, State, local, or private funding to implement mitigation	Section 6, Pp. 6-64 through 6-71	The plan describes those sources of funding that could potentially be used to implement mitigation actions. Those		X

activities?		sources of funding are labeled as 'potential.'		
C. Does the updated plan identify the sources of mitigation funding used to implement activities in the mitigation strategy since approval of the previous plan?	Section 6, Pp. 6-64 through 6-71	The plan provides a summary of the sources of mitigation funding that has been used to implement activities since approval of the previous plan. Specifically mentioned is the Disaster Relief initiative for Hurricane Katrina. That initiative was a special Congressional appropriation through the Community Development Block Grants program to aid relief, recovery and restoration efforts.		X
SUMMARY SCORE				X

COORDINATION OF LOCAL MITIGATION PLANNING

Local Funding and Technical Assistance

Requirement §201.4(c)(4)(i): [The section on the Coordination of Local Mitigation Planning **must** include a] description of the State process to support, through funding and technical assistance, the development of local mitigation plans.

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A. Does the new or updated plan provide a description of the State process to support, through funding and technical assistance, the development of local mitigation plans?	See Section 7, Pp. 7-2 through 7-9	Section 7.2 of the updated plan describes the State's process to support through funding, technical assistance, review, and coordination with FEMA the development and updating of Local Mitigation Plans.		X
B. Does the updated plan describe the funding and technical assistance the State has provided in the past three years to assist local jurisdictions in completing approvable mitigation plans?	See Section 7, Pp. 7-2 through 7-9	Section 7.2 of the updated plan describes the State's process to support through funding, technical assistance, review, and coordination with FEMA the development and updating of Local Mitigation Plans, during the last 3 years. In 2004 the State had no approved local plans. Today the State has 64 approved Local Multi-Jurisdictional, one Single Jurisdictional Plan, and one Plan approvable pending adoption out of a total of 67 Multi-Jurisdictional Plans. The State is in the process of securing funding and providing technical assistance for the updating of 48 County Multi-Jurisdictional Plans		X
SUMMARY SCORE				X

Local Plan Integration

Requirement §201.4(c)(4)(ii): [The section on the Coordination of Local Mitigation Planning **must** include a] description of the State process and timeframe by which the local plans will be reviewed, coordinated, and linked to the State Mitigation Plan.

Requirement §201.4(d): Plan must be reviewed and revised to reflect changes in development, progress in statewide mitigation efforts, and changes in priorities...

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A. Does the new or updated plan provide a description of the process and timeframe the State established to review local plans?	See Section 7, Pp. 7-2 through 7-9	<p>The updated plan contains a seven step plan review process on page 6. Unfortunately, the updated plan does not contain a timeframe for this process.</p> <p>Required Revision:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The updated plan must include a timeframe for the review of new and updated local plans. (E.g. The timeframe for this review process is about nine months. Step 1 will take approximately 75 days [30 days for State review and 45 days for FEMA]. The County will be given approximately 30 days to address comments in Step 3. After resubmitting the plan for final review, the State is again given 30 days to review and FEMA will be given 45 days. Finally, the Plan will be formally adopted in approximately 30 days if no further revisions are required and prior to the Plan being officially approved. Allowing the State 30 day review periods, FEMA 45 day review periods, and the local plan preparation team 30 days to address comments, the review process can take upwards of 255 days, assuming that steps do not have to be repeated. See Section 7 page 8 in the Current Alabama Standard State Plan.) <p>See page 1-57 in the Standard State Plan Update Guidance.</p>	X	
B. Does the new or updated plan provide a description of the process and timeframe the State established to coordinate and link local plans to the State Mitigation Plan?	See Section 7, Pp. 7-9 through 7-17	<p>The updated plan describes the process established by the State to coordinate and link current local plans and future local plan updates to the Standard State Mitigation Plan. See especially Section 7.3.2 and 7.3.3.</p> <p>The process will be conducted on a three year cycle that corresponds to the update cycle of the Standard State Plan. Data that was obtained from the current review process was included in Sections 5.2, 5.5, and 7.3 of the updated plan.</p>		X
SUMMARY SCORE			X	

Prioritizing Local Assistance

Requirement §201.4(c)(4)(iii): [The section on the Coordination of Local Mitigation Planning **must** include] criteria for prioritizing communities and local jurisdictions that would receive planning and project grants under available funding programs, which **should** include consideration for communities with the highest risks, repetitive loss properties, and most intense development pressures.

Further, that for non-planning grants, a principal criterion for prioritizing grants **shall** be the extent to which benefits are maximized according to a cost benefit review of proposed projects and their associated costs.

Requirement §201.4(d): Plan must be reviewed and revised to reflect changes in development, progress in statewide mitigation efforts, and changes in priorities...

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A. Does the new or updated plan provide a description of the criteria for prioritizing those communities and local jurisdictions that would receive planning and project grants under available mitigation funding programs?	Section 6, Pp. 6-35 through 6-63, and Section 7 Pp. 7-18 through 7-21	Sections 7.4, 7.4.1, 7.4.2, 7.4.3, and 7.4.4 describe the criteria used to prioritize communities and local jurisdictions that will receive project grants under available mitigation funding programs. Section 7.4.5 describes the criteria used for planning grants. The criteria used for project grants are contained in the HMGP Administrative Plan for DR-1605-AL. Section 6 contains additional information on prioritizing mitigation actions. Recommended Revision: <ul style="list-style-type: none">The State may wish to include its current HMGP Administrative Plan as an Appendix to its Mitigation Plan.		X
B. For the new or updated plan, do the prioritization criteria include, for non-planning grants, the consideration of the extent to which benefits are maximized according to a cost benefit review of proposed projects and their associated cost?	Section 6, Pp. 6-35 through 6-63, and Section 7, Pp. 7-18 through 7-21	The prioritization criteria for non-planning grants include a benefit/cost analysis for all projects that FEMA has not specifically exempted from this requirement. Criterion b in Section 7, page 18, states that cost effectiveness of the project or action (usually through benefit-cost analysis) is one of the criteria that the Project Application Review Committee will use for reviewing and prioritizing mitigation projects. See especially Section 7 pages 18 and 20. Section 6 contains additional information of prioritizing mitigation actions.		X
C. For the new or updated plan, do the criteria include considerations for communities with the highest risk?	Section 7, Pp. 7-18 through 7-19	Criterion a in Section 7, page 18, states that jurisdictions with the highest risk is one of the criteria that the Project Application Review Committee will use for reviewing and prioritizing mitigation projects.		X
D. For the new or updated plan, do the criteria include considerations for repetitive loss properties?	Section 7, Pp. 7-18 through 7-20	Criterion d in Section 7, page 18, states that inclusion of (flood) repetitive loss properties as identified through NFIP records is		X

STANDARD STATE HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN REVIEW CROSSWALK

FEMA REGION IV

State: Alabama

Date of Plan: July 2007

		one of the criteria that the Project Application Review Committee will use for reviewing and prioritizing mitigation projects.		
E. For the new or updated plan, do the criteria include considerations for communities with the most intense development pressures?	Section 7, Pp. 7-19 through 7-20	Criterion i in Section 7, page 19, states that development pressure on the community is one of the criteria that the Project Application Review Committee will use for reviewing and prioritizing mitigation projects.		X
SUMMARY SCORE				X

PLAN MAINTENANCE PROCESS

Monitoring, Evaluating, and Updating the Plan Requirement §201.4(c)(5)(i): [The Standard State Plan Maintenance Process **must** include an] established method and schedule for monitoring, evaluating, and updating the plan.

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A. Does the new or updated plan describe the method and schedule for monitoring the plan? (e.g., identifies the party responsible for monitoring , includes schedule for reports, site visits, phone calls, and/or meetings)	Section 8, Pp. 8-2 through 8-6	<p>Section 8.2.2 states that plan monitoring will be achieved through AEMA's efforts to track mitigation activities. Sections 8.3 through 8.5 provide details on the monitoring process which includes quarterly reporting, site visits, reviews of goals and objectives, audits, etc.</p> <p>Recommended Revision:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The State may wish to include its current HMGP Administrative Plan as an Appendix to its Mitigation Plan. 		X
B. Does the new or updated plan describe the method and schedule for evaluating the plan? (e.g., identifies the party responsible for evaluating the plan, includes the criteria used to evaluate the plan)	Section 8.2.3, P. 8-3	<p>AEMA will conduct an annual evaluation of the plan usually in November of each year. The Evaluation will consider a variety of factors among which are: changes in the level of risk to the State and its citizens; change in laws, policies, or regulations at the State or local levels; progress on mitigation actions and new mitigation actions that the State is considering; major changes to local and/or multi-jurisdictional plans; etc.</p> <p>AEMA will produce a summary report of its findings and submit it to the SHMT. The report will include a recommendation on whether or not an update is necessary. If either party indicates that an update is warranted, AEMA will initiate the update process.</p>		X
C. Does the new or updated plan describe the method and schedule for updating the plan?	Sections 8.2.4, Pp. 8-3 through 8-4	Section 8.2.4 States that the plan will be formally updated every three years. In addition, if warranted, AEMA in conjunction with the SHMT may initiate an interim update. The process for both types of updates is described in the Section.		X

STANDARD STATE HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN REVIEW CROSSWALK

FEMA REGION IV

State: Alabama

Date of Plan: July 2007

D. Does the updated plan include an analysis of whether the previously approved plan's method and schedule worked, and what elements or processes, if any, were changed?	Section 8, Pp. 8-2 through 8-6	The SHMT determined that the processes described in the original plan required revision to provide the State with greater flexibility.		X
SUMMARY SCORE				X

Monitoring Progress of Mitigation Activities Requirement §201.4(c)(5)(ii): [The Standard State Plan Maintenance Process **must** include a] system for monitoring implementation of mitigation measures and project closeouts. **Requirement §201.4(c)(5)(iii):** [The Standard State Plan Maintenance Process **must** include a] system for reviewing progress on achieving goals as well as activities and projects in the Mitigation Strategy.

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A. Does the new or updated plan describe how mitigation measures and project closeouts will be monitored?	Section 8.3, Pp. 8-4 through 8-6	Sections 8.3.1 and 8.3.2 specifically address these issues. The process and criteria for monitoring mitigation measures are contained in the HMGP Administrative Plan for DR-1605-AL. Recommended Revision: <ul style="list-style-type: none">The State may wish to include its current HMGP Administrative Plan as an Appendix to its Mitigation Plan.		X
B. Does the new or updated plan identify a system for reviewing progress on achieving goals in the Mitigation Strategy?	Section 8, Pp. 8-2 through 8-3, 8-5	The updated plan identifies a system for reviewing progress on achieving goals in the Mitigation Strategy		X
C. Does the updated plan describe any modifications, if any, to the system identified in the previously approved plan to track the initiation, status, and completion of mitigation activities?	Section 6, Pp. 6-28 through 6-63 and Section 8, Pp. 8-2, 8-4 through 8-5	Section 8, especially 8.3, describes the State's system to track the initiation, status, and completion of mitigation activities. This system is outlined in the HMGP Administrative Plan for DR-1605-AL. Additional information is contained in Section 6.		X
D. Does the new or updated plan identify a system for reviewing progress on implementing activities and projects of the Mitigation Strategy?	Section 6, Pp. 6-28 through 6-63 and Section 8, Pp. 8-3 through 8-5	This element is part of the annual evaluation process and the interim and three year update processes. Additional information on success stories and the status of implementing activities and projects is contained in Section 6.		X
E. Does the updated plan discuss if mitigation actions were implemented as planned?	Section 6, Pp. 6-23 through 6-34	Section 6.8.2 discusses the implementation of the Original Plan's Mitigation Actions. Recommended Revisions: <ul style="list-style-type: none">The State should consider preparing a narrative summary for this element for inclusion in Section 8, as it has done for the other elements under this criterion.The State may wish to consider including the Drought Management Plan in this summary.		X
SUMMARY SCORE				X

Matrix A: Profiling Hazards

This matrix can assist FEMA in scoring each hazard. States may find the matrix useful to ensure that their plan addresses each natural hazard that can affect the State. **Completing the matrix is not required.**

*Note: First, check which hazards are identified in requirement §201.4(c)(2)(i). Then, place a checkmark in either the N or S box for each **applicable** hazard. An “N” for any element of any identified hazard will result in a “Needs Improvement” score for this requirement. List the hazard and its related shortcoming in the comments section of the Plan Review Crosswalk.*

Hazard Type	Hazards Identified Per Requirement §201.4(c)(2)(i)	A. Location		B. Previous Occurrences		C. Probability of Future Events	
	Yes	N	S	N	S	N	S
Avalanche	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Coastal Erosion	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Coastal Storm	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Dam Failure	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Drought	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Earthquake	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Expansive Soils	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Extreme Heat	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Flood	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Hailstorm	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Hurricane	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Land Subsidence	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Landslide	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Levee Failure	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Severe Winter Storm	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Tornado	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Tsunami	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Volcano	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Wildfire	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Windstorm	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

To check boxes, double
click on the box and
change the default value
to “checked.”

Legend:

§201.4(c)(2)(i) Profiling Hazards

A. Does the risk assessment identify the location (i.e., geographic area affected) of each natural hazard addressed in the **new or updated** plan?

B. Does the plan provide information on previous occurrences of each hazard addressed in the **new or updated** plan?

C. Does the plan include the probability of future events (i.e., chance of occurrence) for each hazard addressed in the **new or updated** plan?

Matrix B: Assessing Vulnerability

This matrix can assist FEMA in scoring each hazard. States may find the matrix useful to ensure that their plan addresses each requirement. Note that this matrix only includes items for Requirements §201.4(c)(2)(ii) and §201.4(c)(2)(iii) that are related to specific natural hazards that can affect the State. **Completing the matrix is not required.**

*Note: First, check which hazards are identified in requirement §201.4(c)(2)(i). Then, place a checkmark in either the N or S box for each **applicable** hazard. An "N" for any element of any identified hazard will result in a "Needs Improvement" score for this requirement. List the hazard and its related shortcoming in the comments section of the Plan Review Crosswalk.*

Hazard Type	Hazards Identified Per Requirement §201.4(c)(2)(i)	1. Vulnerability by Jurisdiction		2. Vulnerability to State Facilities		3. Loss Estimate by Jurisdiction		4. Loss Estimate of State Facilities	
	Yes	N	S	N	S	N	S	N	S
Avalanche	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Coastal Erosion	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Coastal Storm	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Dam Failure	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Drought	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Earthquake	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Expansive Soils	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Extreme Heat	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Flood	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Hailstorm	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Hurricane	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Land Subsidence	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Landslide	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Levee Failure	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Severe Winter Storm	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Tornado	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Tsunami	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Volcano	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Wildfire	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Windstorm	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

To check boxes, double click on the box and change the default value to "checked."

Legend

§201.4(c)(2)(ii) Assessing Vulnerability by Jurisdiction (see element B)

1. Does the **new or updated** plan describe the State's vulnerability in terms of the jurisdictions most threatened and most vulnerable to damage and loss associated with hazard event(s)?

§201.4(c)(2)(ii) Assessing Vulnerability to State Facilities (see element A)

2. Does the **new or updated** plan describe the types of State owned or operated critical facilities located in the identified hazard areas?

§201.4(c)(2)(iii) Estimating Potential Losses by Jurisdiction (see element A)

3. Does the **new or updated** plan present an overview and analysis of the potential losses to the identified vulnerable structures?

§201.4(c)(2)(iii) Estimating Potential Losses of State Facilities (see element A)

4. Does the **new or updated** plan present an estimate of the potential dollar losses to State owned or operated buildings, infrastructure, and critical facilities in the identified hazard areas?

July 26, 2007

RECORD OF CONFERENCE CALL

SUBJECT: Conference Call with Region IV Mitigation Planners
Alabama Statewide Hazard Mitigation Plan Update
Alabama Emergency Management Agency
URS Project No. 19613755.00100

DATE: July 26, 2007, 9:00 am

PLACE: N/A

ATTENDEES: Mr. Charles Williams, AEMA
Ms. Debbie Peery, AEMA
Ms. Kelli Alexander, AEMA
Mr. George Boughton, FEMA
Mr. Matt Buddie, FEMA
Mrs. Brenda Stirrup, FEMA
Mrs. Joan Bryant, FEMA
Mr. Tom Hunter, URS
Mr. Steve Pardue, VPA
Ms. Stephanie Piranio, URS

George Boughton initiated the meeting by discussing the three required revisions to the Alabama State Hazard Mitigation Plan (HMP) Update. The required revisions to the HMP Update came from the crosswalk of FEMA's draft review.

The first required revision is on Page 7 of the crosswalk - the future probability of winter/ice storms needs to be further defined. The Plan presents the existing occurrence of these events, but it does address the likelihood of future occurrences.

The second required revision is on Page 8 of the crosswalk. The Plan does not address the changes in development for jurisdictions in hazard prone areas. The Plan identifies the top seven jurisdictions affected by wind and flood, and the top nine jurisdictions affected by earthquakes. The discussion of changes in development for jurisdictions in hazard prone areas needs to address these jurisdictions. FEMA suggested a broad discussion that should be about a page in length. Mr. Pardue requested guidance from FEMA, and Mr. Buddie and Mr. Boughton agreed that FEMA could send an example from a plan that was adopted. Mr. Pardue also suggested submitting the revised section to FEMA so that it could be reviewed internally before submitting the final plan. Mr. Boughton said that would be acceptable.

The final required revision is on Page 16 of the crosswalk. The plan does not identify a timeline for the review of local plans. Mr. Boughton mentioned that in the current Alabama Standard State Plan, this was addressed, but it was not included in the HMP Update. It was agreed that this revision could be easily remedied.



It was also suggested by FEMA to include the Administrative Plan 1605 and the updated EMAP as appendices to the HMP Update. AEMA agreed to review the suggestions of including additional plans as appendices to the HMP Update.

The call was closed with a discussion on the timeframe. FEMA mentioned that another SHMT will have to take place before submitting the final draft of the HMP. It was decided to submit the revisions by the end of August 2007.

Alabama State Hazard Mitigation Plan Update

Record of Comments

September 2007

Section	Page	Change(s) Made	Agency
Section 2			
Section 2.3.2	2-2	Added date, <i>August 23, 2007</i> , that the SHMT met to discuss FEMA's initial review and changes that had been made	URS
Section 3			
Section 3.4	3-3	Appendix F will include the Letter of Adoption	FEMA
Section 4			
Section 4.3.1	4-5	Added Alabama Department of Agriculture and Industries as a participating State Agency	AEMA
Section 4.3.1	4-5	Added <i>Mobile</i> to list of cities with National Weather Service offices	AEMA
Section 4.3.2	4-5	Removed " <i>fully qualified</i> " from the statement about mitigation planners on RPC staff	AEMA
Section 4.3.2	4-5	Added that the All Hazard Task Forces is comprised of 12 RPCs <i>and state and local representatives</i>	AEMA
Section 4.3.3	4-8	Added the following sentence to the first bullet point: <i>The All Hazard Task Force meetings are open to any entity involved in the state or local mitigation planning process.</i>	AEMA
Section 4.5.2	4-14	Added paragraph about the <i>August 23, 2007 meeting and comments received, including Alabama Cooperative Extension Program, StormReady, and the 2-year college comments.</i>	URS, VPA
Section 4.5.2	4-17	Table 4.5-1 – included an agenda summary of the August 23, 2007 SHMT meeting	URS
Section 4.5.2	4-19	Added statement that <i>no comments were received from public.</i>	URS
Section 4.5.4	4-22	Included summary paragraph on the addition of Section 5.7	URS
Section 5			
Section 5.2.3	5-22	Additional information was provided for probability of winter storms	FEMA
Section 5.7	5-114	Section was added to address impacts of development trends on vulnerability	FEMA
Section 6			
Section 6.4	6-3	Removed reference to Bruce Baughman	AEMA
Section 6.6	6-15	Removed 2 nd <i>some</i> in the last paragraph (typo)	AEMA
Section 6.7	6-21 - 6-22	Added 2 paragraphs and table on NWS's <i>StormReady Program</i>	AEMA
Section 6.7	6-23	Also referenced <i>StormReady</i> in last paragraph of Section 6.7	AEMA
Section 6.8	6-26	1. Goal 1.3.2 Changed agency from ADHR to ADEM 2. Added note to Table 6.8-2 that action numbers are referenced from 2004 plan.	AEMA, URS
Section 6.8	6-30	Goal 1.3.2 Changed agency from ADEM to ADHR	AEMA
Section 6.8	6-32 6-42	Action 2.2.6 changed wording to: <i>Advance provision for electrical generators for state colleges and universities, including two year colleges through FEMA grant programs, as part of an initiative to develop and maintain all-hazard shelter capacity.</i>	FEMA, AEMA
Section 6.8	6-47	Added Action Item 1.3.6 to the mid-term actions	AEMA
Section 7			
Section 7.2.1	7-6	Identified timeline for the State's process of reviewing local plans	FEMA
Appendices			
Appendix F		Updated with AEMA's current Acting Director	AEMA
Appendix K		Added FEMA's initial crosswalk, record of conference call, and list of comments	AEMA, URS
Appendix L		Added August 23, 2007 SHMT meeting minutes and sign-in sheet	FEMA